

REMARKS

Applicants greatly appreciate the courtesy extended by the Examiner during the interview of May 19, 2004.

Claims 1-2, 5-8, 10, 13-14, and 17-18, and 20-24, and 27 are pending in the application. Claims 10, and 20-24 have been amended. Claims 11, 13, and 25-26 have been canceled. Claim 27 has been added to reinstate former claim 19, and Claim 28 has been added to re-present former claim 13. As indicated during the interview, independent Claims 1, 14, 17, 24, 27 (reinstated former claim 19), and 28 (re-presented former claim 13) are or have been made allowable by the above-mentioned amendments which make the respective dependent claims, Claims 2, 5-8, 10, 18, and 20-23, allowable as well.

From the Office Action mailed July 22, 2003 and the interview conducted with examiner on May 19, 2004, Claims 11 and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being unpatentable over Horsky (U.S. Patent No. 5,703,372). Also, Claim 25 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Horsky. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections, and request allowance thereof in the continuation prosecution application for the following reasons.

Substance of Examiner Interview

Applicants acknowledge with appreciation the courtesy extended to Applicants' representative by the Examiner and Supervising

Examiner during the interview conducted on May 19, 2004.

Applicants' representative and Examiners discussed the allowability of claims 1, 14, 17, and 19-26 in view of the cited prior art, Horsky. The examiners indicated that the recited subject matter of either: 1) the slug and the collar having first and second thermionic work functions, or 2) the introduction of a thermal barrier between the slug and the collar, was allowable. Therefore, independent claims 1, 14, and 17 were currently allowable and other claims would become allowable if reinstated and/or amended to include the indicated allowable subject matter.

The Claims are Patentable Over the Cited References

**Claims 11, and 25-26 are not anticipated or made obvious by
Horsky**

Claims 11 and 25-26 stand rejected under § 102(b) or § 103(a) in view of Horsky. These claims have been canceled making the rejection moot.

Conclusion

In view of the amendments and remarks submitted above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the remaining claims are allowable and a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any

Application No. 10/091,351

overpayments to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (703) 205-8000 to discuss the application.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH, & BIRCH, LLP

By  4/10/05
Michael K. Mutter, Reg.#29,680

MKM/CAG:tm
1028-0178P

P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747
Phone: (703) 205-8000